



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/138,218	08/21/1998	MIKA TARKIAINEN	466-008195-U	3829

7590

10/23/2002

CLARENCE A GREEN  
PERMAN & GREEN  
425 POST ROAD  
FAIRFIELD, CT 06430

EXAMINER

GESESSE, TILAHUN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2685

DATE MAILED: 10/23/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/138,218

Applicant(s)

TARKIAINEN ET AL. 

Examiner

Tilahun B Gesesse

Art Unit

2685

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 August 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Continued Prosecution Application***

1. The request filed on 08/13/02 for a Continued Prosecution Application (CPA) under 37 CFR 1.53(d) based on parent Application No. 09/138,218 is acceptable and a CPA has been established. An action on the CPA follows.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
  2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
  3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
  4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a late invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 1-2,4-6,8-13,15,17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pepe et al (US 5,742,905) in view of Thro et al (US 5,884,159).

As to claims 1,6,12 and 18, Pepe et al disclose method for the transmission of user messages (consumer, an office for example, has various messaging equipments, such as voice mail system<sup>20</sup>, an e-mail terminal 22, fax machine 24 and telephones 26 coupled to a personal communications internetworking (PCI)) using a message service( SMS server 46) to the mobile station of a recipient, who has a primary mobile station( a cellular phone 32) capable of receiving at least voice calls and user messages, (the mobile communications subscriber can receive e-mail, fax, pages and voice messages under a single phone number while using either a wireless or wireline networks, see col. 5 lines 54-62 and fig.3), comprising the step of : Pepe et al disclose directing user messages addressed to the primary mobile station (32) to any of the secondary mobile stations of the recipient, irrespective of whether the primary mobile station is in use (PDA 30 and pager 34, see fig.3 and further more, Pepe et al disclose the subscriber may have notification of voice mail or fax message receipt directed to a wireless PDA in the form of e-mail messages. If the subscriber's wireless PDA is not turned on or otherwise, not operation. The notification may be routed to an alternate wireless or wireline network, see col. 6 lines 11-19). Pepe et al do not forward the entire message to the secondary mobile station. However, Thro et al disclose unattended user messages delivered to secondary mobile station (col. 2 lines 10-26). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to modify Pepe et al. in delivering users message to secondary mobile station, in order to retrieve all message or calls to the user and make sure no message or call is not failed or left unattended.

As to claims 2, 4,9-11,15, Pepe et al in view of Thro et al disclose everything as explained above, further more, Pepe et al disclose activating the secondary mobile station (PDA 30, pager 34, cellular phone 32) up user message forward from phone (26)(fig.3).

As to claims 5,8,13 and 17, Pepe et al disclose using a data computing device (PDA) of the recipient for informing of a received user message to the recipient and to acknowledge the received user message by the recipient, and first directing the received user message to the data computing device and , if the user message is not acknowledged by a determined time, forwarding the user message to the activated mobile station, see col.21 lines 45-63.

6. Claims 3,7 ,14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pepe et al in view of Pepper et al (US 5,930,700).

As per claims 3,7 ,14 and 16, Pepe et al fail to discloses the user messages are generated on the basis of the notification of calendar events. However, Pepper et al disclose the subscriber uses the GUI to enter in his daily schedule and his list of clients. The GUI also alerts the subscriber when the service control module 306 communicates with the PDA about new pending messages and to determine if the subscriber wants to accept a given call or forward it on to the voice mail portion of the service control. The database 308 maintains a network copy of the subscriber's daily schedule and client list which are used, along with the subscriber's default profile, to determine which calls to forward directly to the subscriber at his current location, which calls to forward to the subscriber's voice mail box, and when to let the subscriber decide what to do with a particular call ,see col.5-6 lines 66-68 and 1-11 respectively. Therefore, therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of invention was made to modify to notify the calendar events for Pepe with pepper so that the notification user message forward to the alternative communication device based on time or schedule of the user.

***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

8. ***Any response to this action should be mailed to:***

*Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington, D.C. 20231*

***or faxed to:***

*(703) 872-9314, (for formal communications intended for entry)*

***Or:***

*(703) 746-6042 (for informal or draft communications, please label  
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")*

*Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,  
Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor, (Receptionist).*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tilahun Gesesse whose telephone number is (703) 308-5873.. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 am to 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward F. Urban, can be reached on (703) 305-4385. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 872-9314.

Application/Control Number: 09/138,218  
Art Unit: 2685

Page 6

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4750.

TBG

Oct. 15, 2002

*Tilahun Gesesse*

  
EDWARD F. URBAN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600